TELLS THE FACTS AND NAMES THE NAMES

CounterPunch

JAN. 16-31, 2008 ALEXANDER COCKBURN AND JEFFREY ST. CLAIR VOL. 15, NO. 2

The Clintons High and Low

By Alexander Cockburn

Sally Bedell Smith: *For Love of Politics. Bill and Hillary Clinton: The White House Years.* Random House, 572 pp, 2007.

This is more than a chipper piece of uplift about public service, as one might suppose from the book's soupy title. Though neither freighted with major new disclosures nor memorable in its style, Ms. Bedell Smith's account is cumulatively devastating as she picks her way through the Clintons' eight-year sojourn at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, with flashbacks to their Arkansas years. These are low people.

Now, politics offer many sagas of lowness acting in the service of decent achievement. Richard Nixon was a low character but presided over the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency and passage in 1973 of the Endangered Species Act, the single most significant piece of legislation in American environmental history. Bill and Hillary professed noble intentions endlessly. Page upon page in Bedell Smith's book, even amidst scandal and impeachment, has them raptly discussing constructive "public policy." If mere information was the key to political success, the Clintons would have rivaled FDR and Eleanor. In the White House, Bedell Smith writes, "The Clintons added bookshelves to accommodate their collection of some five thousand volumes. The night tables flanking their queen-sized bed had phones with separate lines and were piled high with magazines, galleys, position papers, and books flagged with multicolored Post-it notes."

Bill Clinton "typically had a half-dozen books going at any one time." His briefing primers "ran more than one hundred pages." He "liked to devour the Department of Agriculture's **acre**age-

COCKBURN CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

Report from El Salvador: Why They'll Keep Coming

By Alexandra Early

Having just spent time south of the border in a poor country whose major export is people, I've seen firsthand what's driving people north – and why conventional political solutions aren't going to deter desperate Salvadorans from coming to the U.S. Largely missing from this year's campaign is any serious reappraisal of our foreign, military, and trade policies that have forced millions Latin Americans to uproot themselves and seek opportunities for a better life far from home.

On the presidential campaign trail, even free trade critics provide little public education about the link between corporate globalization, trade deregulation, and the resulting forced relocation of people, in both hemispheres. For example, while courting blue-collar workers in farm states and the rust belt (often one and the same these days), Edwards frequently denounced the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) – and its new Central American counterpart, CAFTA – as "trade laws that send American jobs overseas". In Iowa, Michigan, and Ohio, free trade has fallen into disfavor because it threatens local manufacturing in rural communities already so economically depressed that some are becoming depopulated. As Lorri Brouer, a middle-aged Iowa Falls gift shop owner, asked a *Boston Globe* reporter in January: "Who's going to turn off the lights when we grow old and die, because all the young people are going away?"

In my recent travels in the Salvadoran countryside, I heard Lorri Brouer's fearful refrain echoed in many small villages (where the absence of people between the age of 25 and 55 is often quite noticeable). In one remote farming community in Usulutan, the remaining peasants were struggling to survive by grazing cattle and growing beans and corn amid cycles of flooding and drought. Most had settled in the region after being made refugees by El Salvador's 12-year civil war. Some had served as combatants against the government forces, which received $4 billion in U.S. counterinsurgency aid during the 1980s. Because most residents still support the left, the right-wing Republican Nationalist Alliance (ARENA) government of Antonio Elias Saca has failed to provide needed agricultural assistance and social services (which are made available to friendlier constituencies instead).

The mother and father in the large family I stayed with proudly showed me middle-school graduation photos of their two oldest children. But their pride was mixed with sadness and regret. Their son and daughter had both emigrated illegally to Houston after completing 9th grade, joining the 100,000 of their countrymen who flee every year. With few employment opportunities locally – and not many in the capital city of San Salvador either – the youth of the town "turn fourteen, and then they all leave", the woman explained. She pointed to the picture of her daughter smiling in her cap and gown: "When we talk on the phone, she says she misses us. She cries and says she doesn't like it there and wants to come home."

This forced displacement of people – a human tragedy on a massive scale – is at the heart of the trade agreements. Enacted fifteen years ago, NAFTA established a now familiar regional pattern. It has allowed U.S. grain companies "to dump cheap corn on the Mexican market, while at the same time Mexico was forced to cut its agricultural subsidies." Poor farmers in Oaxaca and Chiapas can no longer sell their crops at prices covering their production costs. So they've

EARLY CONTINUED ON PAGE 5

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planted reports." He would jolt officials out of deep sleep "to discuss policy questions." Bill's old friend David Leopoulos "believed that 'the job of the presidency' was 'all that Bill and Hillary talked about."

But the gabfests went round and round in circles because very early in Little Rock, Arkansas, Bill and Hillary had also learned conclusively that a hundred worthy position papers, each a thousand pages long, weigh less in the balance of forces than a single phone call from the CEO of Georgia Pacific or Tyson Chicken or Wal-Mart. In tune with the decay of liberalism in the 1970s and 1980s, their political lives were permanently schizophrenic: on the one hand, rhetorical ardor for reform as expressed in Hillary's speeches as board member of her friend Marian Wright Edelman's Children's Defense Fund; on the other, as Bedell Smith convincingly displays, time after time chill betrayal: in the case of welfare, Hillary was the one who ordered the president to sign the Republicans' bill, thus betraying Edelman's life work and everything Hillary claimed she stood for. Bill refused to back Marian's husband, Peter, in his hopes for a federal judgeship, on the grounds he was too liberal and then was too chicken to tell him. Edelman learned of his betrayal in the morning newspaper. He resigned from the Clinton administration over the welfare bill.

The book echoes with the stunned gasps of astounded friends, long-term political supporters and lovers, as the Clintons' knives sank between their shoulder blades: Harold Ickes, tossed overboard in 1997 after playing a major role in saving the Clintons during the Whitewater scandals and getting Bill re-elected (like Edelman, Ickes learned of the betrayal in the newspapers); Webb Hubbell, loyally silent and left to rot in federal prison when Clinton could have pardoned him; Vince Foster, Hillary's bulwark, as he hid her billing records and other compromising documents, helped her dodge subpoenas, evade inquiries into her scandalous commodity trades. Near his end, he was fending off six separate investigations into the first lady's affairs and finally broke under the strain and shot himself, not long after she blamed the whole "Travelgate" mess on him. For the last month of his life, she refused to communicate with her old friend, even though their offices were thirty feet apart.

The book echoes with the gasps of friends, political supporters and lovers, as the Clintons' knives sank between their shoulder blades.

"You lie about what happens," Liz Moynihan, the politically seasoned wife of Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, told Hillary to her face when the latter was embarking on her successful run for the Senate. "You mislead people." Bedell Smith has scores of examples of these traits, along with abundant illustrations of Mrs. Clinton's obsession with secrecy.

Hillary Clinton was a methodical conniver, albeit a disastrous one in the way she managed to alienate all potential allies and, with her monumentally ill-conceived health care program, squandered the new administration's political capital in its first year. Bill, by contrast, was compulsive in the fervid disorder of his White House routines. The most vivid of Bedell Smith's pages portray a man operating well beyond the norms of rational or civilized behavior. His Georgetown professor had told him great men could do without sleep, and so he tried to get by on four hours a night. His eyes would glaze in important meetings. Jolted awake, he would abuse his subordinates in endless, profanity-laden tirades.

"Some aides," Bedell Smith writes, "thought his eruptions were pathological … Years later, Bill explained that he was able to live 'parallel lives,' which he described as 'an external life that takes its natural course and an internal life where the secrets are hidden.' He traced his identity as a 'secret keeper' to his troubled upbringing, when he hid the chaos of his household behind a sunny persona. He had difficulty, he said, 'letting anyone into the deepest recesses of my internal life. It was dark down there. He admitted that over the years his own anger 'had grown deeper and stronger.'"

Since the seedtime of his pathologies – his early childhood – is outside her ambit, Bedell Smith can only display the later consequences of his psychic injuries and vindictive fury at the world, starting with petty aggression toward his fellow humans expressed by being chronically late for every appointment. As president, he kept everyone waiting, including a group of elderly concentration camp survivors huddled for two and a half hours in a tent during a rainstorm until they finally left. Terrified of open conflict and desperate for approval, he drove his staff mad by vacillation in reaching any decision, followed by abrupt switches in direction.

The Clintons' burning sense of injury and persecution furnished them the permanent alibi of dark forces thwarting their efforts to put America on a decent path. Bedell Smith's laconic collage of dysfunction in those first three months of the presidency makes it clear enough. The Clintons, touted to this day as supremely qualified for presidential power, were simply not up to the job. On the Reagans' bedside tables lay only the TV remote and copies of *Vogue* and *Vanity Fair*, but they knew what they wanted and by the end of their first three months in the White House in 1981 had successfully launched the country in a new, albeit sinister direction.

The second half of *For the Love of Politics* is largely devoted to the familiar landscape of Bill's sexual treacheries, mostly notably in his affair with Monica Lewinsky, whose physical intimacies were avidly charted at taxpayers' expense by

COCKBURN CONTINUED ON PAGE 6, COL. 3

CounterPunch

EDITORS
ALEXANDER COCKBURN
JEFFREY ST. CLAIR

ASSISTANT EDITOR
ALEVTINA REA

BUSINESS
BECKY GRANT
DEVA WHEELER

DESIGN
TIFFANY WARDLE

COUNSELOR
BEN SONNENBERG

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558
1-800-840-3683
counterpunch@counterpunch.org
www.counterpunch.org
All rights reserved.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Debate over Israel and Palestine
One state or two?

By Kathleen Christison

Michael Neumann makes a strong case in the last issue of CounterPunch against a single Palestinian-Jewish state as the solution for the conflict in Israel-Palestine. But there are critical flaws in his argument.

Neumann correctly condemns the two-state solution as unjust because it "cements Zionist usurpation of Palestinian land," perpetuating the existence of Israel as "a state based on racial supremacy." But he finds the one-state alternative to this racist two-state solution to be simply impractical. And why? Essentially because Israelis – these same Israelis whom he accuses of racism, land theft, and dispossession of the Palestinians – couldn't conceivably accept it. The notion, he says, "that Israel would concede a single state is laughable. … There is no chance at all they will accept a single state that gives the Palestinians anything remotely like their rights."

Apparently, this is the bottom line: if Israel opposes the idea of a single state, then a single state simply must be an impossible dream, not worth mentioning and certainly not worth struggling for. The case Neumann puts forth is ultimately an argument for the notion that might makes right. Israel has the power to impose its will and the power to avoid unpleasant concessions, and so one state in which Israel would "give up the reason for its existence" is unthinkable.

I find it sometimes difficult to navigate Neumann's logic. He asserts that the two-state solution "is practicable" because "many Israelis can accept it". That old argument again: that if it's okay with Israel, it should be okay for the Palestinians. Furthermore, he says, a two-state solution is "practicable" because the Jewish settlers in the West Bank will leave voluntarily if Israel withdraws and the territory is given over to a sovereign Palestinian state. Neumann rightly makes it clear that anything less than a real, fully sovereign Palestinian state would be unacceptable. But then he brings his own dream of two states crashing down by asserting that Israel will not "by any means … agree to a genuinely sovereign Palestinian state". Exactly. This is precisely why advocates of one state are pushing for this alternative.

Neumann, on the contrary, sees this Israeli intransigence as a major reason for disdaining a one-state solution, the idea being that if Israel will not agree to give the Palestinians rights in a separate state, it will certainly not relinquish its own status as an exclusivist Jewish state by allowing Palestinians equal rights with Jews in a single state. This is, indeed, a persuasive argument – the best in Neumann's arsenal – but it does not take account of possibilities that are themselves practicable in the eyes of many serious analysts. Few foresaw, for instance, that white South Africans would willingly give up their racial supremacy, end the apartheid system, and turn over their fate to a huge majority of blacks. Nor did many foresee the breakup of the Soviet Union.

"Neumann dismisses totally the possibility that two antagonistic people could ever live together in anything like harmony and ignores any comparison with countries where this has worked with some measure of success, such as South Africa and Northern Ireland."

There are other inconsistencies. For instance, in arguing that a two-state solution is practicable because Jewish settlers would readily leave any territory from which Israel withdrew, Neumann uses as an example the Gaza settlers, who he says left "in a large hurry" when Israel disengaged from Gaza in 2005. Yet a few paragraphs later, when he is trying to demonstrate how difficult it would be to induce Israel to give up its Jewishness, he makes the evacuation of settlers from Gaza seem a much more serious problem: in this instance, he muses on how difficult it would be for Israel to relinquish its very raison d'etre, when merely getting the settlements out of Gaza "took thousands of lives and many years." Neumann is more correct in his second formulation about the Gaza settlers: they definitely did not leave in a large hurry but had to be removed bodily and with great trouble.

Neither would most of the West Bank settlers be easy to remove, even if Israel relinquished control, as Neumann believes. Indeed, the fate of the approximately 450,000 settlers in the West Bank and East Jerusalem is by far the most intractable problem facing any peacemaker. The huge numbers of religious zealots, who have moved to West Bank settlements because they believe they are fulfilling a divine mandate, would not under any circumstances "leave in a large hurry," any more than the less zealous Gaza settlers did.

But the monumental problem of the settlers confronts the framers of a true two-state solution every bit as much as it does those who envision a single state. (The reference to a true two-state solution means, as Neumann himself makes clear, establishment of a sovereign Palestinian state, not a "non-state" truncated by the continued presence of large blocs of Israeli settlements.) Neumann dismisses any suggestion that the settlers and their settlements could be incorporated into a single state, and does not appear to recognize that leaving the settlers in place would equally undermine a two-state solution.

Neumann frequently overstates the difficulties involved in achieving a single state and appears to believe that anything short of his notion of absolute justice is actually unjust and unacceptable. A "just solution," he contends, would have to repair the injustice done to Palestinians by Zionism. Fair enough, but he seems to go to unnecessary lengths by requiring as a condition of true justice that Jews who came to Palestine as Zionists, along with their descendants, would have to leave. True justice would also require that Israeli Jews relinquish all homes and property that once belonged to Palestinians.

One-state advocates do not go this far – which, in fact, is the particular beauty of the one-state solution as it is being advocated: there might be, and indeed should be, a truth and reconcili-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ation commission, as in South Africa, to rectify the worst injustices, but advocates of a single state are not vindictive or bloodthirsty and do not demand that injustice be inflicted on the Jews of Israel. The effort to rectify injustices committed against Palestinians – including repatriating those who wish to return, paying compensation for property destroyed or expropriated, and arranging for resettlement and compensation for those refugees who choose not to return to Palestine – would be a massive task, **ne**cessitating careful attention to millions of individual cases, as well as land redistribution and huge compensatory payments.

A single state would not, as Neumann points out, be the democratic paradise that its framers would like – certainly not immediately, and perhaps never. "Notoriously," he says, "the democratic process does not ensure that the will of the majority really prevails. Dominant economic groups know how to confuse, divide and conquer," and the dominant economic group now and into the future is Jewish. It is impossible to argue with this premise, but if Neumann thinks this reality would be different in any two-state situation, he is whistling in the dark. Even in a decent, fully sovereign Palestinian state, the economy would be heavily dependent on Israel: the state would be almost totally landlocked (except for Gaza, whose coastline would be under Israeli scrutiny, if not control), it would be surrounded on three sides by Israel, and it would be dependent on open borders for, among many other things, imports and exports, free movement between the West Bank and Gaza, and labor opportunities for Palestinians inside Israel. Israel will dominate, and could easily strangle, the economy of a separate Palestinian state. In a single state, Palestinians would at least have some say in regulating the state's economy, its commerce and investment, its international relations. Not perfect, but more nearly so than any foreseeable two-state scenario.

There are other problems with Neumann's argument. He dismisses totally the possibility that two antagonistic people could ever live together in anything like harmony, and ignores any comparison with countries where this has worked with some measure of success, such as South Africa and Northern Ireland, and uses flawed models to demonstrate that the one-state idea is not workable. He exhibits some misunderstanding of Palestinian politics and political sentiment when he contends that Fatah and Hamas together represent "roughly 100 per cent" of Palestinians in the occupied territories. In fact, there is a large and growing independent trend among Palestinians dissatisfied with both factions and eager for political alternatives.

Probably most disturbing is Neumann's dismissal of any concept of justice as a reason for attempting to find an alternative solution. He mocks one-state advocates for being too visionary about the justice that a single state would embody. The one-state solution, by his lights, is an impossible dream, and not too well thought out or just in any case. Likewise, despite his greater advocacy of two states and his belief that this would give the Palestinians a "genuinely Palestinian state," he makes it clear that this solution is not really likely either and to his mind is also unjust because it leaves Zionism untouched.

"Since we are all advocating the near impossible, why not advocate the more just impossibility?"

Neumann is no Zionist and, unlike those soft Zionists who want an end to the Israeli occupation but oppose the one-state solution, seems to have no particular desire to preserve Israel's existence as an exclusivist Jewish state. He is totally condemnatory, in fact, of Zionism's unjust, racist nature. Neither, apparently, is he particularly sold on the notion that Palestinians and the advocates of one state are inherently any more moral or just: he raises the suggestion that one-staters might actually intend a bloodbath against Jews and asserts that these advocates treat any Palestinians still working for two states as "sellouts, collaborators, or cowards."This is quite untrue. The Fatah leadership of the Palestinian Authority is frequently labeled collaborationist, but this is not because it supports two states, but because it cooperates with Israel in economically strangling Gaza, scuttling Hamas despite its victory in democratic elections, failing to oppose Israel's settlement program, and so on.

Neumann's dismissal of any notion that Israelis will ever be able to do justice to the Palestinians, as whites in South Africa finally did to blacks, is unsettling. He obviously gives no credence to the substantial upsurge in probing discussion of the nature of Zionism and its uncertain future among Israelis and diaspora Jews. He apparently sees no redeeming qualities in Israelis, no possibility of Israelis submitting to a South Africa-style truth and reconciliation process, no possibility even that over the longer term Zionism will implode from the sheer weight of its injustice and the pressure of demographic realities.

His pessimism is understandable. It is obviously much more difficult to imagine militant religious zealots among Israeli settlers listening to moral appeals about the injustice they have inflicted on Palestinians than it ever was to imagine white racists in South Africa giving up their sinecures and their power. But it is just as difficult to imagine those religious zealots conceding anything to a separate Palestinian state. Which makes the two-state solution just as impracticable and unlikely as one state. And since we are all advocating the near impossible, why not advocate the more just impossibility?

If we discard justice, one wonders where we are left with respect to other critical issues. What use, for instance, is there in ending Israel's occupation at all? If we care only about practicality and not justice, there is no particular reason for Israel to withdraw from the occupied territories. Bush likes the occupation; all the Democratic presidential candidates and even more so the Republican candidates like it; Israel, of course, loves it. The same question applies to other issues. What except the promise of justice fueled past struggles against oppressive but seemingly immovable systems? Justice may ultimately be the only, or at least the primary, reason for pursuing any political cause. For this reason, discussion and advocacy of all alternative solutions to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict must continue. **CP.**

Kathleen Christison is a former CIA political analyst and has worked on Middle East issues for 30 years. She is the author of *Perceptions of Palestine* and *The Wound of Dispossession*. She can be reached at kathy.bill.christison@comcast.net.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

joined the stream of six million Mexicans seeking work here.

The Salvadoran economist Alfonso Goitia sees the same phenomenon occurring in El Salvador, where 40 per cent of the workforce is still employed in agriculture. Out of a total population of six million, 750,000 Salvadorans became political or economic exiles prior to the 1992 peace accords ending the civil war. Today, two million live in the U.S.A. because – under a series of ARENA governments over the last fifteen years – El Salvador has embraced free trade, adopted the dollar as its currency, privatized public services, ratified CAFTA, and consigned a large percentage of the population to continued poverty and exploitation.

In the countryside, small farmers can't maintain their own plots without government support or survive on the wages paid for day labor at larger farms. For those forced to seek work in urban areas, the choices aren't good either. In the manufacturing sector, jobs are concentrated in high-security export zone factories with low wages, sweatshop working conditions, and union-busting multinational employers. An effort last summer by SUTTELL, the telephone workers' union, to organize women assemblers at ABX Industries, an electronic component maker in San Bartolo, led to 30 of them being fired and then blacklisted, with the complicity of the Labor Ministry. As is often the case, the casualties of this campaign – when I met them in November – had been forced into the informal economy, joining the vast army of Salvadorans already peddling fruit, sneakers, toys, packaged snacks, and home-made food items at rickety roadside stands and in crowded central market places throughout the country.

One of the street vendors' biggest product lines – pirated CDs and DVDs – is now making them a special target of local police, trained by the U.S.-financed International Law Enforcement Academy in San Salvador. Where the U.S. once aided and abetted "death squads," it spends millions of aid dollars today orchestrating a crackdown on any would-be infringers on CAFTA-protected "intellectual property rights."

Not surprisingly – given such a problematic urban and rural "job market" – I would regularly see large crowds of people at the American Embassy in San Salvador, waiting for hours with their documents in hand, to apply for some form of legal entry into the U.S.A. A recent study by the University of Central America reported that 42 per cent of all Salvadorans still living in their own country would leave for the U.S. if given the chance. Whether you're approved or not, the nonrefundable fee for the personal interview required to get a U.S. visa is $65 – a hefty sum in a country where the monthly minimum wage is $157. The lines of hopeful people who snake around the high outside walls of the castlelike embassy complex are now enclosed in their own adjacent structure, a kind of immigration bus depot (with a very limited number of tickets available).

Today, two million Salvadorans live in the U.S. because, under a series of ARENA governments over the last fifteen years, El Salvador

When legal entry into the U.S. is thwarted, Salvadorans who can afford to sell any land they own or take out personal loans hire a coyote who charges $4,000 to $6,000 for unofficial immigration assistance. With or without such a "professional" guide, migrants are vulnerable to assault, theft and rape along the long overland route through Guatemala and Mexico. In 2006, the Central American Resource Center documented hundreds of deaths and injuries among Salvadorans attempting to cross into the U.S. on foot. While U.S. newspapers report on local fears about Spanish-speaking invaders, the Salvadoran media regularly runs stories on children who disappear in the Arizona or Texas desert or young women who drown when their leaky boats capsize off the coast of Mexico. Meanwhile back home, family disintegration is a major Salvadoran social problem. Departing mothers and fathers leave their children in the hands of grandparents and other relatives; some kids grow up loosely supervised and feeling abandoned and end up contributing to the country's world-renowned "gang problem." Everyone's favorite local scapegoat, Salvadoran street gangs are indeed violent and a feeder system for a national prison system filled to twice its capacity. And legitimate popular concern about street crime – which has many urban residents afraid to walk outside after dark – is easily manipulated by the right, to further its own program of (civil liberties-infringing) domestic security measures.

Where President Bush and his ARENA allies are actually quite at odds is never publicly acknowledged. In Bush's rosy world view, loyal members of the "coalition of the willing" not only send troops to Iraq (as President Saca did) to bring the benefits of free markets to the Middle East; they also keep folks down on the farm at home – instead of coming to the U.S.—by exposing them to benefits of unfettered domestic capitalism. In reality, El Salvador is heavily dependent on remittances – the earnings of hundreds of thousands of its citizens working abroad. In 2006, Salvadorans sent home $3.3 billion – which equals about 18 per cent of the nation's GDP. These remittances keep the economy afloat and, by cushioning the impact of austerity policies imposed from abroad, operate as a huge social safety valve. With hard-earned dollars from the U.S. flowing to so many lower-income families and communities, there's far less pressure on the government to tax the rich or corporations to pay their fair share of the cost of schools, roads, solid waste disposal, health care, and

Subscription Information

Subscription information can be found at www.counterpunch.org or call toll-free inside the U.S. 1-800-840-3683

Published twice monthly except July and August, 22 issues a year.

1- year hardcopy edition $45
2- year hardcopy edition $80
1- year email edition $35
2- year email edition $60
1- year email & hardcopy edition $50
1- year institutions/supporters $100
1- year student/low income, $35

Renew by telephone, mail or on our website. For mailed orders please include name, address and email address (if applicable) with payment. To renew by phone 1-800-840-3683 or 1-707-629 3683. Add $17.50 per year for subscriptions mailed outside the U.S.A.

Make checks or money orders payable to:
CounterPunch
Business Office
PO Box 228, Petrolia, CA 95558

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COCKBURN CONTINUED FROM PAGE 2

other public services. In another town in Usulutan that I visited, a group of farmers proudly showed me the recently improved road connecting their fields to the closest markets; tired of waiting for public works assistance from the government, they had taken matters into their own hands and, with their own labor and funds – from children, siblings and others working in the U.S. – had done the necessary construction themselves.

Despite stepped up repression (in the form of new laws making various forms of political protest a potential "terrorist" act), Salvadoran social movements are also stirring. Their goal – and, hopefully, campaign platform, when the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front (FMLN) challenges ARENA in next year's presidential election – is to reclaim the idea of national economic development, fueled by much needed public investment. Last fall, thousands of banner-waving Salvadorans marched in the capital to "Defend the Right to Water" – in a major anti-privatization protest aimed at averting a threatened corporate takeover of the country's ailing public water system. On their heads, demonstrators balanced the colorful plastic containers that women and children use to carry water on their long walks to and from wells, springs, and pumps in rural areas. Local speakers were joined by several North American visitors, including former U.S. Ambassador Robert White and Maryland legislator Ana Sol Gutierrez, who joined the call for expanded access to potable water. Unfortunately, only a handful of North Americans currently share their understanding that publicly funded job

42 per cent of all Salvadorans still living in their own country would leave for the U.S. if given the chance.

creation, agricultural assistance, workers' rights, decent roads and schools, and other basic services are exactly what's needed to keep far more Salvadorans in El Salvador, where most would much prefer to be. **CP.**

Alexandra Early is a recent graduate of Wesleyan University in Latin American Studies who worked in El Salvador for CRISPAZ, a cross-border solidarity and social justice group. She can be reached at earlyave@gmail.com. For more information on CRISPAZ, see www.crispaz.

Special Prosecutor Kenneth Starr and retailed yet again by Bedell Smith, who does not quite fathom that the scandal had its benign consequence: paralysis. She refers mournfully to the injuries inflicted on the Clintons' political program by the exposure of the affair and the Clintons' struggle against impeachment. But were it not for Monica Lewinsky and that first seductive glance and provocative display of her underwear, the Clintons would have pressed ahead with the "reform" of Social Security, giving Wall Street access to the pension system's trust funds.

We can draw from Bedell Smith many anecdotes attesting to Mrs. Clinton's penchant for secrecy and lying, also her lack of any consistent political principle. The presumptive impact on Mrs. Clinton of her husband's pathological and unremitting betrayals leaves Bedell Smith slightly at a loss. Leave the last thought to Richard Nixon whom Bill Clinton invited to the White House in March of 1993. As Bill remembered it, Nixon said, "A lot of life was just hanging on." It's what Mrs. Clinton now advertises as "experience". As a political manifesto it's not uplifting, nor encouraging as a biographical intimation of what we may expect. **CP.**

CounterPunch
PO Box 228
Petrolia, CA 95558

Phone 1-800-840-3683 to renew your subscription, buy a t-shirt or CounterPunch books.

1st Class
Presort
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 269
Skokie, IL

First Class

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED